

10/817079

**Remarks / Arguments**

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-19 stand rejected. Reconsideration of the present application in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 13, 15 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,907,311 ("Waldron"). Applicants respectfully submit that Waldron does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention.

The tappet, or cam follower, disclosed in Waldron appears to be identical to the cam in Fig. 2 of the present application. In the Background of Applicants' specification, Applicants explain that the cam follower shown in Fig. 2 is known and is:

designed to have a lower mass. This type of cam follower is similar to the first type in that it comprises a hollow cylindrical member 20 with a cam engaging base surface 22. However, the weight of the cam follower is reduced by providing a socket 24 for receiving the pushrod 26 within the cylindrical member 20. While this design successfully reduces the mass of the cam follower component of the drive train, the benefit is at least partially offset by the mass of the extended length of pushrod 26 required to cooperate with the socket 24. (p. 1, line 23, p. 2, line 5).

The Examiner contends that the tappet disclosed in Waldron anticipates Applicants' pending claims. Applicants respectfully disagree. Although Waldron discloses a cam follower having a cam engaging surface at its base and a pushrod engaging surface, Waldron does not disclose or teach, inter alia, a cam follower wherein the portion of the cam follower between the cam engaging surface and pushrod engaging surface is hollow. Further, no portion of Waldron's cam follower is tapered. Thus, Waldron does not anticipate Applicants' claims.

10/817079

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome by the remarks presented herein and respectfully requests that the Examiner's §102(b) rejections be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,173,954 ("Speckhart") in view of Waldron. The Examiner further rejected claims 3-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Speckhart in view of Waldron and further in view of design choice. Applicants respectfully submit that no combination of Speckhart, Waldron and design choice renders Applicants' claimed invention obvious.

As discussed above, Waldron does not disclose, teach or otherwise render obvious a cam follower having a substantially cylindrical form, with a cam engaging surface to a base of the substantially cylindrical form and a pushrod engaging surface to the other end, the cam follower being hollow and characterised in that the substantially cylindrical form tapers toward the pushrod engaging surface such that the portion of the cam follower bearing the pushrod engaging surface is substantially conical and substantially hollow. Particularly, Waldron does not teach a tapered cam follower that is hollow between the cam engaging surface and pushrod engaging surface, specifically in the conical portion. Accordingly, Waldron's cam follower suffers from the same deficiencies as the known cam followers referenced in Applicants' specification. Specifically, Waldron's cam follower can not provide the extent of weight reduction provided by Applicants' claimed design. Moreover, Waldron does not disclose, teach or suggest any solution to the problems addressed by Applicants' claimed invention.

10/817079

Speckhart also fails to disclose, teach or suggest, inter alia, a cam follower that is substantially hollow throughout a conicular portion. Instead, Speckhart teaches a roller tappet with a substantially hollow cylindrical central body and a substantially solid tapered portion. (See Speckhart Fig. 8). Accordingly, the combination of Speckhart and Waldron fails to render Applicants' claimed invention obvious. There is no suggestion or motivation provided in either Speckhart or Waldron to incorporate a substantially hollow tapered portion.

Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments made above with respect to Waldron and Speckhart place independent claim 1 in condition for allowance and that the Examiner's contention that claims 3-12 are obvious over Speckhart in view of Waldron and design choice have therefore also been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the Examiner's rejections have been overcome by the remarks presented herein and respectfully requests that the Examiner's §103(a) rejections be withdrawn.

10/817079


**Conclusion**

Applicants assert that this application is in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application and feels that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 372-2000.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 13-0206 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

  
Patrick D. Richards  
Registration No. 48,905

227 West Monroe Street  
Chicago, IL 60606-5096  
Phone: 312.372.2000 PDR:MWE  
Facsimile: 312.984.7700  
**Date: April 21, 2006**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 1923  
as our correspondence address.**

CHI99 4619237-1,070459.0013